

The Republican.

No. 28. Vol. 6.] LONDON, Friday, Dec. 6, 1822. [PRICE 6d.

TO THE REPUBLICANS OF THE ISLAND OF GREAT BRITAIN.

Dorchester Gaol December 2,
Year 3 of the Spanish Re-
volution.

CITIZENS,

I HAD prepared this week a long address to the Republicans of the Island of Hayti, but am compelled to defer it, in consequence of the multitude of letters I have received with subscriptions, so numerous, as, I fear, to keep me in arrears two or three weeks further, in regard to printing them. I must, therefore, content myself with introducing to your notice the particulars of an

Outrage committed by the Scottish Law Officers upon the Edinburgh Freethinkers' Zetetic Society.

This was a Society established in Edinburgh for the practice of free discussion and mutual improvement. It was open to any one who thought proper to enter, and every one was allowed to express his sentiments on passing topics under discussion. It was held in a convenient and spacious hall, called Cordiner's Hall, Potter's Row, and possessed a library of the most useful books and a pair of globes. It may be considered the commencement of a philosophical institution for the improvement of the tradesmen and industrious classes of Edinburgh. This Society has been established upwards of twelve months, and has had regular weekly meetings on that day which the law has set apart for rest from labour, for cleanliness, and for mental improvement.

On Sunday the 17th instant the Meeting was interrupted by the Sheriff, the Superintendant of the Police, and a large body of the Sheriff's Officers and Police Officers. If the Sheriff had been a philosopher he would have gone alone, for he would have known that philosophers make no other kind of war than a war of words. The meeting was a very

full one, and it happened that the first speaker was a stranger, who had made some notes on the proceedings of the former Sunday, and he requested leave to express his sentiments thereon. He did this in a spirit of aggravating ridicule, doubtless, with the view of creating a noise, but he was heard quietly out, and Mr. Robert Affleck rose and exposed the fallacy of his attempting to ridicule what he could not refute. This was no sooner over than in pounced the Sheriff, and with a great deal of agitation stepped upon a table and said, that he had received information that an illegal meeting was held there weekly, and that blasphemous discourses were delivered. The strangers all made their way to the door, but the members of the Society, conscious that they had done no moral or legal wrong, collected and called to the strangers to keep their places. The Sheriff then called for a Mr. Gray who was President the former Sunday, but he was absent. He then called by name, Mr. James and Robert Affleck, who immediately stepped forward and were declared prisoners, together with a Mr. Wilson, the Chairman of the day. The Officers were evidently surprised at the numbers and respectability of the persons present, and there was a hesitation and dilatoriness in all their proceedings.

Mr. Robert Affleck perceiving that he and his brother were the only persons wanted, proposed to the Sheriff to let all the other individuals leave the place, which was acceded to, first taking down the name and residence of every individual, and taking from his person all books or papers he happened to have about him. The Officers then proceeded to rifle the library, taking away what books they thought proper, which, with the prisoners, were lodged in the Sheriff's Court.

On Monday upwards of twenty witnesses were examined in secret, and these examinations were continued the whole of Tuesday and Wednesday, when the prisoners were admitted to bail, the two Mr. Affleck's in £100 each, and Mr. Wilson in £60. The Mr. Gray who was called for and absent, has since, with upwards of one hundred and fifty persons connected with the Society, tendered their names to the Sheriff as witnesses of its proceedings.

If the Ministers in London, or the Lord Advocate in Scotland, expected to find any thing like a political plot here, they have been miserably deceived. The Members of this Society confined themselves to such conduct as their title expresses. *Freethinkers' Zetetic Society*, signifies a society, the members of which think freely on all subjects, and pro-

ceed to the developement of truth by a zetetic or analytic mode of argument and demonstration: that is to say, they believe nothing until it has undergone the fullest investigation.

The Zetetic Societies of England have nothing to fear for themselves on account of the outrage committed upon that in Edinburgh; I would not have them suspend a single meeting on account of it. I will pledge myself to sicken the government of prosecutions for what are called blasphemous writings and expressions. The principles which are denominated blasphemous, have sufficient moral power to be making their way throughout the community, in a manner so rapid and extensive, as was never before witnessed, with principles of any one religious sect whatever. The moment an individual finds mental courage to undertake to examine our principles, that moment he is obliged to assent to their morality and political importance, and to confess that they are paramount to all others. We hold to nothing, in fact, that can be shewn to be ill-founded.

The Scottish newspapers are beginning to howl about blasphemy, and to lament that the principles of Carlile have reached to Edinburgh. Vile and odious hypocrites (whether Whig or Tory) do they not know that, almost to a man, the Colleges of Physicians, of Surgeons, and of Advocates, in Scotland, are composed of men of Carlile's principles; which were the principles, before Carlile was born, of Burns, of Adam Smith, of David Hume, of Lord Kaimes, and we may go back to every name that is honourable to the Scottish nation, and find that they were persons of Carlile's principles, even to Fletcher of Saltoun, and Buchanan the historian. "The Scotsman," Whig paper, hoists the following colours, or motto:—

"This is not the cause of Party, or of Faction, or of any Individual, but the common interest of every man in Britain."

Now would it be believed, that under such a motto as this, the Editor or Proprietor of this paper would refuse to insert a letter from a respectable individual, Mr. Gray, explanatory of the views and character of "The Edinburgh Freethinkers' Zetetic Society," in consequence of the outrage committed upon the members, and the arrest of two of its managers. Yet this corrupt paper sets up a howl about blasphemy, and hypocritically pretends to lament the spread of such opinions a prosecution in Edinburgh will occasion. I will be bound for it, the fellows connected with this paper,

are thorough-bred Atheists. I know that in London, the Editors and Proprietors of those papers, who make the most howl about blasphemy, are notorious Atheists. Old Slop himself is a notorious Atheist: in short, a man cannot be really and truly intelligent, until he arrives at that state of mind to estimate rightly the superstitions which pervade mankind.

Nothing is known yet, what ulterior measures the Lord Advocate of Scotland will pursue with Messrs. Affleck's and Wilson, but it is notorious that any further measure will arise from a dread of discussion, however temperate, upon the superstition and idolatry of this country. In all its essentials it is the same in Scotland as in England. The greatest crime attaching to those men will be that of their being my open and avowed friends. Their moral characters as men and tradesmen are unimpeachable. I have no personal knowledge of them: It was my being persecuted that brought them around me, and, when they came forward, they did it honestly, boldly, and manfully. If they suffer under the rigour of Scottish law, I swear to revenge their wrongs by redoubled efforts to expose and destroy that idolatry and corruption which it is their crime not to support. I will brave and put down all prosecutions on this account in England, for I have, at this moment, men who are angry at not being called forward for prosecution.

Dorchester Gaol, Dec. 1, 1822. R. CARLILE.

AN APPEAL TO THE REFORMERS,

*Who disapprove of the horrid deeds done at Manchester, on the fatal
16th of August, 1819.*

CITIZENS, THE Reformers of Ashton-under-Lyne deem it their duty to make this Public Appeal on behalf of the four men (namely, Charles Walker, Joshua Hobson, Samuel Clayton and James Higson) who stand charged with Sedition, it being the first attempt to prosecute under the Act denominated Castlereagh's Seditious Meeting Act. Their Charge is, suspending a Black Flag on the 16th of August last, from the Union Rooms, with the words "MURDER! AUGUST 16th, 1819, &c." They are to take their Trial at the New Bailey Court, Salford, the next Session. It is the particular wish of the Committee, and likewise the four individuals indicted, not to be judg-

ed and sentenced by the instigators and abettors who conducted and executed the business of that fatal day.

It is therefore their wish to remove it to another Court, this they are aware they cannot do without the voluntary contribution of a generous Public; they therefore with confidence throw themselves on that Public for assistance: For surely, when wicked men combine, good men should unite.

Signed by order of the Committee,
EDWARD MERCER, Treasurer.
JOSIAH MATLEY, Secretary.

Ashton, Nov. 11th, 1822.

TO MR. R. CARLILE, DORCHESTER GAOL.

“ Though no shining sun nor twinkling star
Bedeck’d the crimson curtains of the sky;
Though neither vegetable, beast, nor bird,
Were extant on the surface of this ball,
Nor lurking gem beneath; though the great sea
Slept in profound stagnation, and the air
Had left no thunder to pronounce its Maker;
Yet MAN at home, *within himself* might find
The Deity immense, and in that frame,
So fearfully, so wonderfully made,
See and adore his providence and power.”

SMART.

DEAR SIR, Somers Town, Nov. 17, 1822.
As I think your newly-embraced doctrine of Materialism founded in error and destruction of the happiness of mankind, whose happiness I nevertheless believe it to be your wish to promote, in disseminating that doctrine, although mistaken, as I conceive, in your views, I beg leave, through the medium of your bold and fearless publication, “The Republican,” to offer your readers a few remarks on that doctrine.

Your letter to that unsophisticated inquirer after truth, Mr. John Goldsmith, contains propositions which I am convinced cannot be satisfactory to his mind. They must leave him as undecided in his opinion as they found him. This notion is, that animal existence must have emanated from God; but, unlike a bigot, he appears to be prepared to adopt any other more rational belief.—He, therefore, addressed himself to you, in the hope, as I conceive, of your advancing arguments tending either to strengthen or falsify his notions. In the event of your treating his notions as chimerical, he had a right to expect good and sufficient reasons for abandoning them. He had also a right to expect from you the developement of a more rational

system. Whether you have done the one or the other will be seen in the course of my remarks.

It is not my intention to combat every proposition that I find in your letter. I shall confine myself to the leading points; and my observations on these will, I think, embrace all that is material concerning your doctrine.

The first proposition that I shall notice is, that respecting the animal stomach. You contend that the action of the stomach, or, in other words, "the operation of matter upon matter," is no proof of intelligence in the animal itself.

The stomach of man may be compared, and not inaptly, to a piece of mechanism—the steam-engine, for instance, and like that machine, having been once set in motion, requires no great degree of intelligence to keep it in activity. Mere animal instinct is sufficient to that purpose, so long as the stomach remains unimpaired. Supply the machine with fuel, and the stomach with the necessary aliments, they both continue in motion from necessity. And whence arises this necessity? The necessity is involved in their construction; unquestionably not in their intelligence. A being who never possessed a glimpse of that vital and luminous essence—a born-idiot, is as strongly excited to satisfy his hunger as the man who possesses the most highly-gifted genius. But all this, Sir, is no proof of the *non-existence* of intelligence, which your arguments would seem to imply.

Well, then, we both agree that the action of the stomach evinces no proof of intelligence or design in the animal itself; but there still exists a material difference between us in opinion. Your opinion is, that because intelligence, or rather design, cannot be found in the way you have chosen to seek for it, that, therefore, there is no such thing as intelligence or design in the construction of the stomach.

Do you admit that a piece of complicated machinery bears evident marks of intelligence: I mean of intelligence having been employed upon it? If you admit this, I would ask you if intelligence be a property of the materials of which the machine is composed, or of the individual whose genius gave arrangement and organization to its parts? If you admit that there are marks of intelligence in this piece of machinery, and have a desire to preserve your consistency by not falsifying your own arguments as to the non-existence of intelligence in the operations of the animal stomach—if you admit the one, and have a desire to maintain the other, to what conclusion do you inevitably arrive? Why, to this naked and undistinguished avowal, that intelligence may exist independent of, and unconnected with, the thing bearing evident marks of intelligence having at one time acted upon it.

If you are disposed to admit the fact, that intelligence may exist independent of the thing bearing its marks, allow me to ask what great stretch of our reasoning faculties does it require to believe in the existence of the Deity—the Great Architect of the Universe? I am not disposed to quarrel with you about the dimensions, or even

the particular form of the Deity: I merely say that the doctrine is false which will not allow of his existence, because he does not exist every where at one and the same time. Is it necessary to the continued action of a machine of human invention, that the inventor should be always present? No, surely not. He has made the thing so perfect, that it requires only the attendance of the least intelligent of mankind to direct its operations. But the Deity has done more than this: he has constructed a machine, to which he has added a property of the very highest character—intelligence.

You do not, I am aware, deny the existence of intelligence, but contend that it is the production of a peculiar organization of parts, which, by taking from it its immortal essence, you render contemptible. That the head of Thomas Paine, being of “a peculiar organization,” which organization having given birth to a something—a nothing—which compelled his hand to make certain marks upon certain sheets of paper, which you, by some means or other, contrived to imitate and send forth into the world, with a desire that all the world might know what the concussion of the several parts of which Thomas Paine’s mind was composed had produced;—that the meaning which the world had given to those marks should have had the effect of enraging a certain number of individuals against you, to such an excess, for making those productions known, so as to cause your body to be thrown into a dungeon, and your shop ransacked of your property;—that these important effects should have been produced by a cause so simple in its nature—a thing of no more substance than the note from a flute, or the sound from a bell, and almost as circumscribed in its duration, is truly wonderful.

You say “that intelligence is a property not in itself natural, and that it is not or was not the property of the first of the human species. It is a property that has been accumulated by human speech and action.”

If the genius of intelligence had not existed in the human head from the time of its creation—a something to be cultivated, which required time and exercise to expand itself into what is called intelligence, intelligence could never have existed, any more than the oak tree could have been perpetuated without the acorn.

If, on the other hand, intelligence be produced by speech, and speech not a consequence of intelligence, how is it that the ass has made so little progress in intelligence? There’s speaking for you! If speech, or rather noise, could produce intelligence, I know of no animal possessing fairer pretensions; for when he chuses to open his mouth, his speech is any thing but a whisper. It cannot be denied that he makes bold attempts at unfolding his intellectual faculties, if he have any; and there is as much intelligence in his noise as in that made by the savages of the South Sea Islands; yet the poor devil might bray to eternity without advancing a single step in the way of mental improvement. This you may consider frivolous; but is it more so than your assertion, that speech preceded intelligence? Every man knows, that at one time or other, he has had ideas which

he was unable to communicate intelligibly, until he made himself more acquainted with language or speech. But what do you mean by speech? Do you mean any thing more than noise? You cannot; and where would be the use of speech without intelligence? If intelligence be really produced by the making of a noise, how is it that the long-eared gentleman above-named has exerted his oratorial powers to so little purpose? The reason is, I suppose, that he wanted that "peculiar organization" of which you speak. Speech is merely the means by which intelligence is communicated to others, but neither the beginning nor the end of intelligence itself.

In the course of your arguments you further say, that the Savages of New South Wales "have capacities to be cultivated." Capacities to be cultivated! What! cultivate a thing which has no existence, and that too, by means which are in themselves the very essence of cultivation! If, as you say, these savages have capacities to be cultivated, that is, the genius of intelligence existing in their minds, what becomes of your assertion, that intelligence is not natural? As well might you say that walking is not natural to man, because it requires great exertion and care in the infant to accomplish it. We have proof positive that walking is natural to man, by a reference to our legs.

You likewise say that intelligence is a perishable capital. As it affects nations from age to age, I grant, but not as it affects individuals, it being impossible for a man to un-know what he knows, unless he, by intemperance, destroys his faculties. In this case he is imperfect, and not what he originally was: he is a man in his second childhood, as much as the man whose faculties have failed him from age and infirmities.

You confess your ignorance of the origin of mankind; but you, at the same time, relate the notion entertained by some of the Grecian Philosophers, as being, it would appear to your mind, as plausible as any in existence. The notion of these was, that they were engendered in the corrupt slime that was left on the earth when the waters subsided from a particular place. By way of illustrating this absurd notion, you add, "We have now every proof that is desirable in this climate, that a summer heat engenders insects from corrupt animal and vegetable matter." This illustration, coupled with what you further say on this subject, makes it appear, that if you are not absolutely wedded to this notion, you at least have a sort of sneaking affection for it.—You say, "Now, there is nothing more marvellous in the cause that produced the animal man, than in that which produced the smallest insect, for the organization of each is equally wonderful, and equally above the power of what we know intelligence to be, to execute." Thus then it would appear that the forefathers, the progenitors of intellectual man, might have originally been no bigger than maggots, (as animals engendered in filth are never known to be very large) unless indeed they come to maturity on the instant, which is not very likely, without reversing the order of things. We all know what great care, trouble, and anxiety we cost our pa-

rents in the present day. But, cast into life thus abruptly, is it not wonderful to think how man wriggled through his maggoty existence till he attained his present dimensions? Nothing, for certain, short of a miracle could have preserved him. I don't mean a bungling miracle of the Christian description; but one emanating from that undefined old Hag—what do you call her?—"Necessity!" she, I mean, who flung the wriggling imp into existence.

"Good lack! in this its slimy bed,
Who sat and watched its infant head?"

But to be serious. The nature of man must always have been the same. Infancy, with its consequent helplessness, must have formed the first part of man's existence; unless, indeed, as I before observed, our first parents arrived at maturity at once, which is an absurdity, according to the Grecian doctrine, at least. But you say, "that there is nothing more marvellous in the cause that produced the animal man, than in that which produced the smallest insect." The devil there isn't! I beg pardon; this language is certainly unphilosophical. But is it not notorious that insects and other small animals have the instinct of self-preservation, and of providing for their wants the first moment of their existence? You must allow that the animal either attained instant maturity, or had to pass through the different stages of existence, which in our day, is the nature, not merely of man, but of all animals existing. Adopt which you will and endeavour to defend it upon the Grecian or any other system excluding a great Superintending Intelligent Power, you will find yourself involved in difficulties, from which nothing can extricate you. If you advocate the doctrine of instant maturity, I ask you how blind necessity could have had the fore-thought to hit upon the sexual system as a means of perpetuating the species? You disclaim all ideas concerning design; but if there are not evident marks of design in this, there is no such thing in the construction of machinery. If you abandon this idea, and adhere to the other; namely, that of passing through the different stages of existence, how do you account for the preservation of the human animal till it attained its maturity? Are you not aware that mankind require a greater length of time to arrive at maturity than any other animal? In this state of things, the poor helpless animal man must have been a prey to all other animals, they having arrived at maturity long before the human animal was capable of walking, to say nothing about the manner in which it supplied itself, or was supplied, with nourishment until that period. But you may say that it was not necessary that all animals should have been created at one and the same convulsion of nature, or subsiding of the waters, or what you will, for my doctrine will apply equally to all. Yet it seems pretty clear to me that man must have been the first animal flung into existence, in order to effect his preservation. This being the case, a second convulsion of nature, or if you will, a second inundation and a second subsiding of the waters, was necessary to produce the rest of the animal tribe. There's a dilemma! A second

convulsion, with the necessity of preserving the animal man during this convulsion!

This is a sorry doctrine, and I am truly astonished that any man, in any age or country, could have been found to advocate, or even countenance it.

My remarks are now concluded. I hope I have not, in the course of them, said any thing to give you the least personal offence, than which nothing could be more foreign to my intention. I sympathise in the fate of a man who has sacrificed his own, to promote his country's liberties, and brought down the vengeance of the "powers that be" on his own devoted head. Such a man are you. I felt proud to see an Englishman stand up in a Court of Justice as the Champion of the Principles of our immortal countryman, Thomas Paine, to whom it is impossible to pay a higher compliment than to stile him the author of "Rights of Man," and "Age of Reason." For scattering through the world the rays of light contained in these volumes, I honour and respect you. This light, however, had no sooner shone, and had its due effect upon the public mind, than the dark banner of Mirabaud came sweeping on, throwing a melancholy gloom upon the face of nature, and deadening and nullifying those bright perceptions which Deism alone is calculated to inspire—affrighting the imagination—making life miserable—death loathsome.

With best respects to Yourself, Wife, and Sister,

I remain your well-wisher,

THOMAS ELLIOTT.

P. S. You will find in the parcel Twenty Shillings towards your liberation, which I hope will be speedy.

TO MR. THOMAS ELLIOTT, SOMERS TOWN,
LONDON.

SIR, Dorchester Gaol, Nov. 24, 1822.

YOUR letter demands some remarks from me, though I refer you for a further explanation on the principle and property of intelligence, to some observations I made on a communication from J. E. C. in the 24th No. of this work. The Man, who argues upon and adheres to an imaginary cause, without first proving *demonstratively* the existence of that cause, is a bigot. This you do with regard to an intelligent Deity.

I am as anxious to discover an intelligent being superior to man as you can be; but I candidly confess that I can discover no such existence, and as I cannot discover it, I will not

create a mental phantom, or fill my mind with an illusion for an idolatrous purpose. I will not be a bigot. I will not profess a belief where I can give no reasons for it: I will believe nothing where I cannot comprehend the probability, or be assured of the certainty; and I will speak and write what I do, and what I do not believe. I have no doctrines. I teach nothing: but am willing to discuss every thing and to have every thing discussed.

At the outset of your letter, you say you will not combat every proposition that you find in my letter to Mr. Goldsmith, but you will confine yourself to my leading points; but I must tell you, Sir, that you have not done this. You have altogether shrunk from my argument about intelligence, and have perverted its application. Can you, Sir, trace *intelligence* any where beyond the animal organization? Yes, you say, "I find it in the construction of every animal and trace it to the power that first produced them." What is that power? Here you can give me no answer, and if you cannot, what proof have we that it is intelligent? The power to produce animals has existed we know, but we do not know that it now exists, because we have no proofs of it beyond the production of insects. Is that power an emblem of intelligence that blasts the vegetable and produces the insect? or is there intelligence in the corrupt animal matter that produces the maggot? Has the cheese intelligence that produces a myriad of mites? Or the hock of bacon with its family of hoppers? Whence come they think you? How does a maggot come in a nut that has a perfect shell?

Insects are animals

But you ridicule the idea of comparing man to a maggot. Such a notion shocks your pride, your bigotry! Man is a mere maggot at the time of conception, and for days after; and is known to proceed from matter decomposed and corrupted by inflammation. How does this square with your immortal soul? with your immortality? with your immortal intelligent God? Man is an insect engendered in corruption, and sooner or later becomes the prey of other insects, if he passes a natural course, as all other insects become the prey of each other. When a man's intelligence be brought to this standard, he will then set earnestly about the production of mutual and general happiness among his fellows in this life, and not become affrighted, and miserable, and loath death as you imagine. I contemplate all these things with pleasure, with a dignity of mind; and though I do not desire death, I do not loathe it, and am assured, that I

could meet it, if free from pain, with as little terror as I would meet a meal, and with less terror and prejudice than I should feel to kill a fowl for my own dinner. I could not perform the latter circumstance without a painful sensation, though I would perform it to preserve or lengthen my own life; yet, when I saw death was inevitable, my mind seems to tell me, that I could meet it with the composure of a Socrates, and without feeling the necessity of the amusement to kill a cock as a sacrifice to Esculapius.

But, Sir, I have digressed and have unwittingly replied to you, where reply was not called for. My observations on the probability of the means that first produced man was by no means a leading point in my letter to Mr. Goldsmith. I pleaded ignorant upon the matter, asserted nothing, and expressed my willingness to remain ignorant where there was no probability of proof ever rising to view. You have attempted wit and ridicule, you have played on the surface without touching a leading point in that letter. There was but one leading point and that may be comprised in the following question: Is intelligence any thing distinct from an animal organization, or is it to be found elsewhere?

20129
I cannot agree with you that it was my duty to develope any new theory of the universe. Mr. Goldsmith did not require such a thing from me. I have a right to shew the inadequacy of any man's system, without subjecting myself to the necessity of laying down one more rational. The latter circumstance must be a matter of choice to myself, and about which I am not bound to satisfy any one's judgment but my own.

In reply to the alledged contradiction, you fancy you have led me into about a machine that is the result of human intelligence carrying the marks of intelligence with it, and that the human body being a machine carries the marks of being the work of intelligence with itself, I observe, that the machine which is the result of human intelligence does not carry marks of intelligence with it, but is a mere inanimate means to produce an end, and is comprehensible to other human beings as being the structure and design of human intelligence: but as I have before observed about the cheese and bacon, where can we ground a notion of intelligence on the cause that has produced the maggot man, or any other maggot: or where the least proof that the common mass of maggots (or animals if you like the term better) are results of intelligence superior to human intelligence, for we know that human intelligence

is not yet equal to the making of the most simple animal machine. This is the right way of *essaying upon man*. Let all mankind know that a King or a Priest are mere maggots, and then we shall lay the foundation of human happiness and improvement, but so long as we crave immortality, and the support of an almighty intelligent Deity, we must keep up Priests as necessary actors in the farce, and Kings to fill out the plot, or to have the necessary gradations from one folly to the other. I call upon mankind to get rid of all those follies, to assert their equality, and thus lay the foundation for general and lasting human happiness by asserting an equal right to a free discussion and a full and free enquiry into all subjects. They should hold nothing sacred but such truth as cannot be proved error; and then, instead of veiling it as the Priests do their *sanctum sanctorum*, they should hold it up to the common gaze, that all may profit and regulate their actions by it.

We can trace the first cause of a machine made with human hands, we can make others like it or better; but can we find the slightest trace of the cause that produced the machine, or maggoty machine called man? I speak confidently when I say that man has not the least conception of intelligence distinct from himself and other animals. Show you the contrary if you can. It was your duty to have done it before you had dipped your pen in satire and ridicule. Both simple and important as the subject is, it ought always to be treated philosophically. By the time you have read my answer, I rather think you will feel the weight of your own satire. It was not supported by truth, consequently it could not pierce me. I have caught each shaft and thrown it back again where it best applies.

The braying of an ass is not speech: it is the only sound an ass can make from its mouth, whilst speech is the result of a varied and variable combination and a desired application of sounds, peculiar to the organization of the animal man. The braying sensations of an ass are certainly as important as the speech and notions of a man who affects to believe an existence of which he cannot form and delineate, in or from his mind, the slightest conception: A fancied existence that carries no archetype with it.

I thank you for the share you have taken of my Fines, and I hope you will receive this letter as written in the spirit of fair and free discussion, and one that has led to our mutual improvement. I truckle to no man's mind: I borrow no man's mind: but from the examination of all that come in

my way, I endeavour to form a correct mind of my own. This I take to be the whole duty of man. It forms independence, knowledge, spirit, in fact, nothing deserves to be called *mind* that is not perfectly free and uncontrouled.

I am, Sir,

respectfully yours,

R. CARLILE.

TO MR. R. CARLILE, DORCHESTER GAOL.

SIR, Comptor, Nov. 20, 1822.

I WISH you had had time to answer the Hull letter, or at least that part of it where Mr. Jackson speaks of the immoral tendency of Materialism. He has got hold too, I see, of that nonsense, about people not being Christians who do not act up to some moral precepts contained in the New Testament. We may as well say that those people, who acknowledge themselves Atheists are not Atheists, because they do not invariably act up to the maxim of "Do to others as you would be done by," for all, I think, will allow that to be a good maxim. A man is a Christian who believes Jesus Christ to be the son of a God, and that he died to redeem the world from the wrath of his Father; and he is an Atheist who does not believe in any supernatural being whatever; let their moral conduct be what it may.

I will thank you to accept of the enclosed Four Sovereigns from Joseph Rhodes and myself. It may seem strange that we, who are regularly receiving money *from* you, should send money *to* you, but we simply say, that the money is *your* own. We should not think we were doing right to keep money by us, when you and Miss Carlile are now *imprisoned for want of money*. We have it over and above what is sufficient to keep us comfortable. Accept of it, and you will please us.

Yours, respectfully,

H. BOYLE.

TO MR. R. CARLILE, DORCHESTER GAOL.

SIR,

Upper Seymour Street.

I RECOLLECT that the Bible, at your trial in Guildhall, was suppressed; and I know there have been instances of females, and youths, being ordered out of court whilst certain passages of it were reading; but never till I read the 21st Number of "The Republican," did I hear of any parts of it being attempted to be prosecuted!

For what else can the proceedings against the article bearing the signature A. D. (which the prosecutors of Mr. Swann have named a wicked, malicious, and blasphemous libel, and of which I have no hesitation to acknowledge myself the author,) be termed but an attempt to prosecute parts of the Bible?

For what have I said in that article that could be construed into a libel? I said the Devil told the truth; and who was the witness I brought to confirm it? No less a personage than God himself, in the chapter and verse referred to. If I charged Jehovah's biographer with making his hero utter a falsehood, what grounds have I for the charge? Why, the very book which all these cruel, ignorant, and degrading prosecutions are instituted to defend? If I had said such and such things are not in the Bible, and thus have uttered a falsehood myself; then, indeed, there would have been just grounds for the charge of libel, and I should have deserved punishment for uttering a palpable falsehood.

The Pope, and the Roman Catholic priests, who know well what sort of matter the Bible contains, wisely make it a crime for a Roman Catholic to have a complete Bible in his or her possession: this I call sound policy, if there be any truth in Dean Swift's observation, "That all sublunary happiness consists in being well deceived." But our ignorant and besotted Bishops and Priests, think a free and extensive circulation of the Bible will be the means of keeping up their system of fraud and imposition! Vain mortals! for they are nothing else, let them continue the circulation of the Bible seven years longer, as they have done for the last seven years. With "The Republican" constantly attacking and exposing by the force of argument, not by arguments of force, and they will be astonished at their own stupidity, in not foreseeing the situation in which it will place them. The people, on account of the corruptions and the oppressions of the Church as established by law, dissent, and go from sect to sect, until they have accumulated knowledge enough to become Deists or Atheists, and of these there are enough already, if they were allowed to form numerous congregations or meetings throughout the country, but instead of enjoying this natural right, which all men are entitled to, almost every word that is uttered by a Deist, even in the vindication of his faith, is construed into a libel, by the tyrants and impostors under whom he is compelled to live.

It appears now that a much greater man than me has expressed a wish to have the Bible revised and abridged. It is reported that Mr. Denman, the City Common Serjeant, on a late occasion said, "it is a pity that some of the obscene passages (in the Bible) are not omitted." It is a pity, indeed, that a book which is put into every child's hand in the kingdom to read, as the express word of God, should contain passages that would put the cheek of modesty to the blush; absurdities that would make a Judge feel shame; and contradictions that even an impudent Priest dares not face. This is the book, to criticise which is blasphemy! Even he who makes

unfavourable quotations, incurs the displeasure of Almighty God! according to the priests, although one of their creeds denounces eternal torments to every one who does not believe that God is incomprehensible.

I will now conclude by giving Lord Ellenborough's definition of a libel, at the passing of the Six Acts, which I have versified for the benefit of the memory; and which exhibits at one view, not only what constitutes a libel in the twenty-second year of the nineteenth century; but the certain fate that awaits all public writers, whether political or theological, who have honesty enough to assert the truth, or boldness enough to defend it when it is asserted.

DEFINITION OF LIBEL.

Whoever says an evil thing,
 Against the dead or living King;
 Or uses disrespectful words
 Against the Commons or the Lords;
 Or who makes any busy mention
 Of sinecure, or place, or pension;
 Or hints at any alteration
 In the State Representation!
 Or censures any institution;
 Or rails against the Constitution!
 Speaks ill of any legislation;
 Or any Judge's explanation!
 Or who for pious robbers search;
 Or satirizes Mother Church!
 Or cavils at the Holy Bible!
 Is guilty of a wicked libel;
 For which offence, the punishment
 Is fine, and long imprisonment:
 But, if condemned a second time,
 Transported to a foreign clime!

ALLEN DAVENPORT.

TO MR. R. CARLILE, DORCHESTER GAOL.

Salford, Manchester, Nov. 16, 1822, the era

DEAR SIR, of the supposed Carpenter's Wife's Son.

A FEW zealous advocates for free discussion who, with Professor Lawrence, are looking forward to the time, when "the increasing light of reason that has destroyed so many remnants of ignorance and barbarism shall finally accomplish the grand purpose which however delayed cannot be ultimately defeated, THE COMPLETE EMANCIPATION OF THE MIND, the destruction of whatever may be detect-

ed as idolatry and superstition, and the establishment of full freedom and belief:" send to you greeting.

Our chief motive in troubling you with this, is to request your acceptance of a small token of gratitude towards the liquidating of those most disgraceful fines, and barefaced public robbery, that licensed banditti, the Ministers and Judges have committed upon your property; likewise to inform you and the friends to free discussion, that we have commenced and are establishing a Reading or Zetetic Society in Salford, and that every "*Priests day*" evening shall be devoted to free discussion. That any person, whatever his creed may be, shall be allowed to deliver verbally, or in writing, his opinions on any proposed subject whatever. We feel persuaded your giving publicity to this, will be a great means of strengthening our society, and stimulating others to adopt similar plans for the acquirement and dissemination of knowledge, to pull down ignorance and superstition wherever the advocates of the *Christianities* and *isms* may have erected them.

Another object we have in view is to keep up a regular subscription for persecuted individuals in the cause of free discussion; for this purpose, our first meeting we honoured by a hasty subscription for your cruelly treated family, and to which there was no opposition but the smallness of our numbers and our circumstances, to our wishes.

Shame upon the hypocritical cant about "loving your enemies," about "doing good unto those who despitefully use you:" and that applauds the conduct of Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego, as asserted in the Jew Books, for not falling down to worship the golden image, because it appeared as idolatry to them, when, like wild beasts of prey they are worrying and devouring all who dare advocate the right of free discussion, by casting them into the fiery furnace of Dorchester, &c. for not falling down to idolize a George Rex, a Jesus Christ, a Mahomet, or a Moses, at the sound, not of the "psaltery or sackbut," but by the command of the Nebuchadnezzars, the Priests, and the Magicians of the present day.

We sincerely hope that the Republicans of the island of Great Britain will bestir themselves in your behalf. We are happy to see that you increase in numbers towards the payment of that *scheme* for public robbery, and that your friends will soon be able to liberate you from a loathsome dungeon. Let the different facts of the persecutions, the robberies, &c. that you have been subject to be thundered in the ears of the hard-hearted unmerciful Christians. There are many of these Christians humane enough to acknowledge the cruel treatment you have received, but they care no more about it; they do not think that your cause demands action, and that to look silently on such proceedings is the same as sanctioning the tyranny. **JUSTICE** compels them to contribute towards such persecuted individuals. **TRUTH** cries out, the practice of free discussion is the only way to discover me, and lead mankind from falsehood and su-

perstition to which they are at present such wretched slaves. An honest man will not profess any thing contrary to his understanding, in short, he professes to be governed by his **UNDERSTANDING** and not his **WILL**, he makes his *will* subservient to his *understanding*, and not his understanding subservient to his will, and if a school-master is allowed to keep a school, or a parson to preach, every man is justifiable in avowing openly his sentiments, for to prohibit the one they must prohibit the other, and as error is truth to every honest man, if he does not see to the contrary, he is bound to propagate his sentiments as a lover of truth; and as nothing is error to any man that is not proved to him to be an error, the Deist is justifiable in crying down the Christian religion, if his evidence is sufficiently clear against it.

JOSEPH LAWTON.

In sympathy for yourself and persecuted family, we subscribe ourselves your sincere friends of the

SALFORD ZETETIC SOCIETY,

Held at the House of George Longbottom, No. 7, Borrow Street, near Oldfield Lane.

	s. d.		s. d.
Thomas Wood	1 0	of iron! and burning with	
George Longbottom	2 0	fire!!! Oh! shocking, what a	
Thomas Steel	1 0	cruel God they worship!	1 0
Joseph Lawton, an Advocate for Free Discussion	5 0	P. H. a Friend to Liberty	0 6
William Smith	1 0	A. J. E.	1 0
A Widow's Mite	0 6	John Watson	1 0
A Friend	0 6	J. H.	0 1
A Friend T.	1 0	A Friend	0 6
J. C. Not a Man after God's own heart? Axes! Saws! Harrows		A Friend	0 3
		Samuel Crowther, a Friend to Liberty	0 6

TO MR. R. CARLILE, DORCHESTER GAOL.

DEAR SIR,

London, November 15, 1822.

THE public have long been told, are now told, and no doubt will be told and told again, that the restoration of their rights is at hand; and upon what grounds such assertions are made, I am at a loss to conjecture. It may perhaps be considered a bold assumption; but one of two things must be the case; either the Radical and Reform writer intentionally deceive, or are deceived themselves; in either case, the result must be productive of mischief. For my part, as an inquisitive spectator of events, I have never seen, with the exception of the time of the first appearance of Mr. Cobbett's Twopenny Register, and the day of the Queen's funeral, the smallest hope or chance of any radical change, and, even upon those occasions, the

chances were one hundred to one, all things considered, against any beneficial alteration in the arrangement of state affairs. I will not now, even hint at what I consider the cause why those fallacious assurances are held out, but that they neither have been, nor can be, productive of any good, I am, and have been long, well convinced.

In preference to pampering the public appetite with this delectable food, it were better that the plain truth be told; or if exaggeration be necessary at all, the public had better be made to imagine, that the powers they have to contend against are greater than they really are, and that the period of their emancipation is more distant than it is in reality; for in that case, their hopes and their exertions would be in proportion to the nature of the disease against which they have to contend; and they would not be tempted to desert and ridicule a cause, in consequence of the insincerity or ignorance of its advocates, who, like the boy in the fable, are continually crying, *Wolf!* till nobody believes them.

I am aware, that I may be told, that unless this stimulus were held out, the people would relax in their exertions; but, once for all I assert, that delusion and falsehood never did any good, nor ever will! The conduct of the Reformers in this particular, resembles the practice of the believers in supernatural events. In the common concerns of life, both Réformers and Religionists require incontrovertible proof of the accomplishment of their expectations, whilst in politics, the reform leaders expect their adherents to rely upon promises, a thousand times made and broken; and the Priest modestly insists, that his improbable tales, two or three thousand years old, should be believed as mathematical demonstrations.

If the realization of our hopes of a change, is built upon the failure of the resources of the Government, it is built upon a very sandy foundation, and upon what other foundation it rests I cannot comprehend. In addition to the tythes, which the Government may make their own whenever they please, there are the church lands, which are of immense value. The sums in Chancery are likewise immense, not that they, of course! will ever be otherwise than *properly* appropriated. It is also in the power of Government, by the alternate issue of gold and paper, to make purchases at whatever price they please; so as, progressively, to become the proprietors and vendors of all the property in the country. Besides a variety of other resources, the increasing population of the country is their grand salvation! The amount of money required for sinecures, bribery, army, navy, debt, &c. remain comparatively stationary; whilst a doubled population is a doubled quantity of contributors to the necessities of the Government. The possession of these means, together with their long established and consolidated power as rulers, their army, navy, pension, police, &c. leave little doubt of their being enabled to wade through their numerous difficulties, and of their preventing that alteration of men and measures, we all so much stand in need of and desire.

I hope, therefore, that you for one, will not hold out any hopes to

the public that do not carry on the face of them, the moral certainty of speedy realization. Reform, I assure you, has become with the majority of the enlightened inhabitants of London, nothing better than a "bye word and a proverb," and well it may! In what degree are we nearer the accomplishment of our wishes than we were twenty years ago? Is that period of baffled exertion any proof of our success? Are the number of patriots metamorphoze into placemen and pensioners in the course of that time, any proof, any prospect for the future? Are the "Six Acts," any proof? The people, I allow, have become considerably more enlightened than they were, but what of that! Are they not a more defenceless, dismembered, shackled, and passive herd than they have ever hitherto been? Their knowledge of the nature of the evils they are enduring is something, certainly, but is of no more advantage to them than the knowledge the inveterate drunkard possesses, who knows he is pursuing a wrong course, but will not, or cannot get out of it; the disease is the same in both, and the remedy the same. They must both cure themselves: that is, be their own regenerators.

It may be, that in some particulars we have gained a march upon the enemy; but for one that we have in our favour, they have possessed themselves of fifty against us. You may rest assured, that whatever we may think of our triumphant successes and such other pomposities, that the government need not wish to be better treated than by our exultation over such puerile achievements, and our reliance upon such "ropes of sand" as we have hitherto trusted to. It is not, I grant, to be expected, that a few public spirited and intelligent writers should possess of themselves power enough to overthrow the parks of artillery and the forests of bayonets that are arrayed against the liberties of the country; all they can do, is to enlighten the public mind, and to direct it in such a course, that it may possess a simultaneous movement, should any opportunity occur for seizing upon its long lost rights.

I shall not now, trouble you with any further observations upon this subject, being well convinced, that no one will act more conscientiously and correctly in the discharge of the duties of a public writer than yourself; and have only to express my regret that the enclosed sum is not of larger amount, but such as it is, "we give unto thee."

Third Subscription from Mr. Radical's, St. James', £5. 5s.

I remain, dear Sir,

Your most obedient and humble Servant,
HOWARD FISH.

P. S. I have the pleasure to transmit to you, at the request of the author, a copy of a mythological work, by George Mackey, Norwich, which proves, astronomically, that the world is at least, by existing records, between four and five millions of years old. You will perceive by the title of the book, that the author, like the redoubtable translator of Juvenal and editor of the Quarterly, is a shoemaker*;

* See the life attached to the translation of Juvenal, by William Gifford.

the lucubrations of Mr. Mackey are, however, of a different nature to the performances of his brother "knight of the lap-stone," and require and evince, consistency, intuitive ability, and what Mr. Locke calls, "good sound round about sense." Mr. M. has not left cobling "boots and shoes," like the Quarterly Reviewer, to snob politics; nor does he possess the meanness that attempts to vilify, degrade, and oppress the swinish herd among which himself was littered. The rights of humanity, and the possession of a clear unclouded mind, are of more importance to Mr. Mackey than the wages of the hireling scribbler, who either does not possess ability enough to see clearly, or has not sufficient integrity to pursue the honest path if he does see it. The author, though he has followed the notable example of his brother of the last, in leaving the useful classes, has not like some others, become a pest to society; his work is of universal application and of great sublimity. May success attend him!

H. F.

TO MR. R. CARLILE, DORCHESTER GAOL.

SIR,

I THANK you for inserting in "The Republican," the two letters which I had requested to be inserted in "The Manchester Guardian," but which the Editor of that paper had not sufficient patriotism or rather philanthropy to insert. You are pleased however to observe, that if my object be the reclamation of Christians, I shall declaim against the inconsistency of their faith and practice in vain. And you add, that if I intend to set up the Bible, as a work on Political Economy, I shall be able to defend but a few points thereof, against your attacks: and that it is as preposterous to expect to borrow money without interest, as to live in another man's house without paying rent. Now, Sir, is it to be observed, that the best books, whether on Morality, on Theology, or on the Arts and Sciences, can never make us either wiser, or better, unless we read therein, and sufficiently meditate thereon? I say sufficiently; that is, so much as to enable us to understand them, and to be governed by their principles and precepts.

This I am afraid is not the case with mankind generally, with regard to our Scriptures: and I am pretty confident, the general and practical principles thereof, are grossly misrepresented by the generality of our clergymen, too many of whom, are the mere tools and parasites of the rich and great, as is abundantly evinced by their preaching up the doctrine of passive obedience to the people on all occasions. Now, Sir, the Scriptures represent the Deity as the Creator of the heavens and the earth, and all things therein and thereon: whether Mines, Minerals, Vegetables, Animals, or Men. They tell us too, that God has given the Earth, the Vegetables, Animals, &c. to the *children* of men, and that "the profit of the

earth is for all." When God is represented as giving these things to Adam, to Abraham, to Noah, &c, he is stated as giving them to *them, and to their seed*; that is to their children generally; and not to them and to their heirs at law only. Read Numbers chap. 26, and 27, and you will see what is called the Lord's decision upon this subject. And is not this doctrine agreeable to the nature of things and of man. Is not food essentially necessary to the existence and preservation of every human creature, and equally so? Do not the Scriptures represent God as being "no respecter of persons," and as requiring every man "to do unto others as he would that they should do unto him." Can any man conform to this injunction, who by his idleness, or wastefulness increases the task, or diminishes the comforts of his fellow creatures. And can any man, whether called King, Prince, Duke, Lord, Bishop, or Priest, spend his time in idleness and luxury, without oppressing the poor, and taking from them the fruit of their labour? Are not oppression, extortion, and defraud, in all their various modes, condemned and reprobated in the Scriptures! "Ye shall not oppress the hireling in his wages." When thou sellest or buyest aught of thy brother, ye shall not oppress one another. Neither shalt thou lend to thy brother upon usury;" again, do not Scriptures enjoin all men to labour, "working with their hands the thing that is good, that they may have to give to him that needeth." Do not the Scriptures also pronounce a "woe unto him that decree unrighteous decrees, to take away the right from the poor, my princes shall no more oppress my people. O Princes of Israel, remove violence and spoil; and execute justice, and judgment: Take away your exactions from my people, saith the Lord. Are not Judges charged to judge righteously, and to hear the small, as well as the great?" How often does the Scripture say unto kings, "If ye will keep my statutes and judgments then will I establish your throne? but if ye will not keep my commandments and my statutes, then will I cast you off." Again "when thou shalt set a King over thee, he shall not multiply horses to himself, neither shall he multiply wives to himself, neither shall he greatly multiply to himself silver, nor gold, but he shall learn to fear the Lord his God, to keep all the words of this law and these statutes to do them: that his heart be not lifted up above his brethren: to the end that he may prolong his days in his kingdom." Again "It is not for Kings to drink wine, nor for Princes strong drink, lest they drink and forget the law, and pervert the judgment of any of the afflicted." With respect to interest of money and rent of houses being equally just; I apprehend there is a very obvious distinction. Houses are subject to decay, and frequently stand in need of repair, and therefore a rent equivalent to these expences, is just and equitable, independent of the interest money which the building cost. Now, Sir, to those who believe the Scriptures to be the word of God, and who believe God to be the "King of Kings, and Lord of Lords," How is it possible that they should expect usury or increase of their brethren, after reading Exodus, chap. xxii.

ver. 25. Leviticus, xxv. ver 36. Deuteronomy, xxiii. ver. 19, 20. Nehemiah, 5th chapter. Ezekiel, 18th chapter? If these passages have been dictated by the "King of Kings, and Lord of Lords," shall Kings and Lords dare to decree otherwise? or shall those who profess to believe this to be the command of God, dare to act in opposition thereto? Besides, what is the effect of the practice? Is it not to enrich those who have already more than they need; and still further to impoverish those, who are already in want? And what I would ask, are the causes of the hard tasks and general poverty of our labourers; but our enormous land-rent. The interest of our unprecedented National Debt; and the exorbitant salaries of our public servants, both in Church and State. These are the roots from which all our political evils flow; and are they not all condemned in the books which we, as a nation, profess to hold sacred; Is it not well known that excessive riches are an excessive evil, even to their possessors? And is it not equally well known, that excessive poverty is an evil, and that the latter excess, inevitably results from the former: and both from the practice of usury? Is it not therefore very natural that he, "who careth for all," and who is "no respecter of persons," should absolutely prohibit a practice, pregnant with such evils to his children. Imagine yourself, therefore, the creator of such a globe as ours, and also the father of such a creature as man, and then say whether you would not give the land to every one according as they had need: and also prohibit the practice of usury, which is pregnant with such incalculable evils; and produce those two absurd combinations, *idleness, luxury, and riches*, on the one hand: and *industry, frugality, and poverty*, on the other? I must now conclude, as it is near the time to dispatch this, hoping you will favour it with a place in "The Republican."

I remain, yours respectfully,
J. KNIGHT.

OBSERVATIONS.

I GIVE insertion to this letter more from respect to the writer than for its contents. John Knight says, there is an obvious distinction between money paid for the rent of a house and money paid as an interest for the loan of money. And how does he explain this obvious distinction? Why, by saying: "Houses are subject to decay and frequently stand in need of repair, and therefore a rent equivalent to these expences is just and equitable, independent of the interest of the money which the building cost." And this is a very obvious distinction is it? The very attempt to explain the alleged distinction is its destruction, and proves there is none, it proves that paying rent for a house is but paying a man interest

for the money he has expended on that house. John Knight's argument is this: "It is right to pay a man rent for a house as an interest for the money he has expended upon it; but if you borrow money and build the house yourself, it is not right to have to pay interest for that money." This is the plain inference of his explanation without the least colouring.

Capital, of which money is a part, can never become a common property: it must always and necessarily exist in the character of individual property, over which the individual should hold absolute power. If this be not the case, there can be no such thing as property. If my neighbour had capital, say money, which I had not, and if I had the power to demand the loan of that capital, without the payment of an interest for its use, it would be equivalent to deprivation to him, and a worse scheme than the present enormous taxation of individual property. The idle and profligate who live now by the taxes drawn from industry, would live then by exact the same means, saving that they would have to ask or to demand the loan themselves. An argument against the right of interest is equivalent to an argument against the right to refuse to lend: the practical part of which would throw every thing into confusion, as all would become borrowers whilst there was any thing to borrow. Talk as much about money as you please, it is nothing more than any other species of capital or individual property, for which you can find a demand, if you are disposed to sell or exchange. In moving from hand to hand it is a thing of barter, as much so as any other kind of metallic utensil. Paper money, or rather written notes of credit, is another thing; it is to real property what religion is to morality. Whilst all are impressed with a value attaching to it, it passes current, but when forgeries take place, when the credit is such as to awaken a fear of unsoundness, away goes the spiritual phantom like a bubble bursted in the air. We have no longer faith in it, we hate it, and reject it with contempt as a thing of no value when offered to us having discovered that the promises are mere words and are not supported by any physical substances.

I wish to give John Knight a hint, that the "King of Kings and the Lord of Lords," has not begun to exist yet, particularly in this country. Such a god will never be found until we find a SOVEREIGN AND INTELLIGENT PEOPLE! I claim John Knight as a proof of the assertion. I told him once before that his Bible God was good for nothing as he

so zealous and sincere an adherent and worshipper was continually in the fangs of the oppressor.

Man must learn to trust in himself alone, and not in any of the things—the phantoms which have passed current under the denomination of Gods, before he can acquire rational liberty. It is an outrage upon common sense and common honesty to be giving us scraps from the Jew Books, the Jewish Scriptures, as imposing lessons from God. It may contain moral expressions, but why not let them stand on their own weight without calling them *falsely* the word of a God. Morality has no need of the aid of religion or of any kind of God. It is most powerful when it stands alone and on its own weight.

R. CARLILE.

ISRAEL VINDICATED.

(Concluded from Page 863.)

Amiable Grégoire! We, indeed, recognize in you a zealous and powerful advocate of our persecuted and afflicted race. Although you did not live to witness the happy period when we should be restored to our legitimate rights, and be able to hold up our heads, and say, in truth, that we are men; yet, doubtless, you must have anticipated an era, which cannot be far distant, and in that anticipation have enjoyed the reward of your labours, in a cause which ensures immortality to your illustrious name.

You have frequently, dear Isaacs, recommended to my notice the writings of the celebrated Dr. Franklin.—I have perused the works of that great philosopher, and have found, as you assured me I would find, much to admire and to instruct. He was a formidable enemy to bigotry and intolerance, and it were to be wished that his countrymen had, to a man, imitated so bright an example. They can lose nothing by showing kindness, by being indulgent, and by recognising the natural rights of their fellow-men. Tranquillity of mind, and a reciprocity of benefits would follow a conduct so truly amiable. It is true, that our nation continue firmly attached to their religion: but was not this religion inculcated by Jehovah himself? And if, on examination, we see no cause to renounce it, why should our adherence to the laws of heaven, be charged against us as a

crime? The Nazarenes may continue to pity us, for what they are pleased to call obstinacy. We shall not quarrel with them on that account; but let them not refuse to admire the constancy, resolution, courage, steadiness, and disinterestedness, with which we give up so many advantages for what they themselves esteem valuable, namely, the privilege of worshipping the God of our fathers, without fear or molestation, and in the way which coincides with our consciences. This is a matter which every Nazarene acknowledges to belong to the Almighty, and himself only, to be beyond the controul of man. We ask no more than to have the same indulgence extended to us; to have our civil rights, as men and as citizens, recognized, without regard to our religious opinions. When this is conceded, then, and not till then, will those who plead for universal toleration act a rational and consistent part, and show to the world that they are truly desirous of conferring the blessings of liberty on all their species, and of promoting the cause of august truth. As children of the same Parent, are entitled to participate alike in the bounties which he has conferred upon his creatures, we should then unite in promoting the general welfare. Having the same interests, we should cheerfully contribute our share of the public expence, and in the hour of danger cordially join with our fellow-citizens in repelling the invader. The public cause would at all times be our cause; the enemy of public liberty would be our enemy. Holding, in short, the dignified rank of citizens, we would be every thing implied in that honourable appellation.

Having, dear Isaacs, brought to your recollection the name of the venerable Franklin, I shall here transcribe his celebrated "parable against persecution," which I always peruse with delightful sensations, and which, I trust, will soon be more generally acted upon in this, as well as in other quarters of the globe, than it is at the present day:—

" And it came to pass, after these things, that Abraham sat in the door of his tent, about the going down of the sun. And behold a man, bent with age, coming from the great sandy wilderness, leaning on his staff. And Abraham arose and met him, and said unto him, turn in, I pray thee, and wash thy feet, and tarry all night; and thou shalt arise early in the morning, and go thy way; and the man said, nay; for I will abide under the tree. But Abraham pressed him greatly: so he turned, and they went into the tent. And Abraham baked unleavened bread, and they did eat.

And when Abraham saw that the man blessed not God, he said unto him, wherefore dost thou not worship the most high God, creator of heaven and earth? And the man answered and said, I do not worship thy God, neither do I call upon his name; for I have made to myself a god which abideth in my house, and provideth me with all things. And Abraham's zeal was kindled against the man; and he arose and fell upon him, and drove him forth with blows into the wilderness. And God called unto Abraham, saying, Abraham, where is the stranger? And Abraham answered and said, Lord, he would not worship thee, neither would he call upon thy name; therefore have I driven him out from before my face into the wilderness. And God said, have I not borne with him these hundred and ninety-eight years, and nourished him and clothed him, notwithstanding his rebellion against me; and couldst not thou, who art thyself a sinner, bear with him one night?"

To persecute a religion, says Grégoire, is always the sure way of rendering it dearer to those who profess it. Mankind have had too many opportunities of being convinced of the truth of this observation. In such cases, self-love is interested in preserving principles which have cost torments. Besides, misfortunes which sometimes induce people to commit crimes, and frequently reduce them to despair, seldom incline them to incredulity; because a man abandoned by society, naturally turns his eyes towards heaven, in order to find consolation for his sufferings.

Farewell, dear Isaacs; may the God of Abraham always guide and protect you.

NATHAN JOSEPH.

LETTER XXXII.

Progress of Inquiry—Neglect of Jewish Writers—State of the Nazarene Religion—Conclusion.

DEAR ISAACS,

I HAVE taken up the pen to address you for the last time, on this side the Atlantic. I intend visiting all the principal cities in Europe, and informing you, from time to time, of every thing curious, which may come under my observation; particularly as respects the superstitions of this celebrated quarter of the globe. Meanwhile I approve of your determination to publish the series of letters, which I have lately written to you on the subject of our holy religion. It

has always appeared to me a great disadvantage to our nation, that so little has been given to the world by those among us, who are so well able to combat with our literary adversaries. To this circumstance alone, may be attributed that odium which is attached to us in almost every quarter of the globe. Men have been progressing in knowledge since the commencement of the fifteenth century. In the arts and sciences, and even in matters of faith, many wonderful revolutions have taken place, all tending to humanize and render the mind more liberal. But in one particular there seems to have been no progression. The scandal, the heaps of lies, which had their birth at an early period of the Nazarene era, and which have since been industriously propagated over the whole earth; these monstrous and absurd calumnies against our nation, instead of having subsided along with the gradual disappearance of error, seem to have gathered strength in many countries, are not totally extinguished in any, and even in the United States, where universal toleration has established its benign sway, these barbarous prejudices of the first ages are not without their influence. To what, dear Isaacs, ought we to attribute this shameful state of matters, but to the want of energy on our part to dispel these mists of darkness. Why is it that we are every where treated as an ignorant and stupid race, incapable of mental energy, and even despised by many sensible and acute observers? For no other reason (and it must be confessed the reason is good) than that few efforts have been made to rescue us from public obloquy. Our greatest literary characters have hitherto stood aloof, and allowed every thing that malice could invent, to be widely circulated, without essaying to stem the overwhelming torrent.

It is true, that the rigorous laws and restraints upon our nation in Europe, afford a good reason for the inactivity of our Rabbies in that quarter, although I still think, they have evinced symptoms of lukewarmness, and frequently neglected to take advantage of times and circumstances, when they might have employed their pens with effect. But no excuse can be found for so long a neglect of this in the United States, where our nation form a population of upwards of three thousand, are daily increasing in numbers, in wealth, and in importance, and when no obstacles stand in the way of our publishing a just defence of our principles, and of vindicating ourselves, through the press, from base and unfounded charges. Proselytism can never influence a true Israelite in the present state of the world. He never

can be found supporting societies for propagating his faith. His confidence is placed in the infinite power of Jehovah, who can turn the hearts of men to the true worship, when it pleaseth him, and who will accomplish this in his own time, without regard to the puny and presumptuous efforts of mortals, who vainly think that they are capable of giving an impulse to the Almighty, and of hastening the fulfilment of his eternal decrees. There is, however, a defence of our just rights, and a rank in society, which we are entitled to hold, and to maintain by every lawful means in our power. The law provides for the security of our property, and we never hesitate to resort to it when we suffer injury. The same law guards our character and reputation. Shall we, then be slow in vindicating what is dearer to us than wealth? Shall we remain for ever passive in what is of greater importance to us than existence, while we continue alive to the security of what cannot add a day to the number of our years, or ensure permanent happiness? Rouse then my brethren; rouse from the lethargy into which our nation has been so long plunged. The times are favourable to the exertion. It is absurd to suppose, that nothing can resist the efforts of the Nazarenes to spread their faith. Has not experience taught us, that they must fail? Nearly twenty centuries have elapsed, since the founders of their system assured them, that the kingdom of their Messiah was then to be established; that the knowledge of his doctrines would be conveyed to all ends of the earth. But how have these predictions been fulfilled?—Of seven hundred millions of people that now inhabit this globe, the Nazarenes cannot count more than 213 millions, even at the utmost stretch, to whom the *name* of Jesus has been communicated; while the other 550 millions, and which, of course, include our nation, are, according to them, sitting in the valley and shadow of death. And this, notwithstanding all the labours of the Bible and Missionary Societies in Great Britain, and in America, was the state of matters in the month of April, 1816*.

To be indifferent when our rights are questioned, shows that we are undeserving of them. To submit to insult and defamation, without one struggle in our behalf, is clearly criminal. We possess the means of doing ourselves justice, by exposing the vile machinations of our enemies. Let us, then, wield the weapons, of reason and of truth on every occasion that offers. In this way, and in this way only, can we dispel prejudice, overcome hostility, and resume that

* Christian Herald, vol. 1. p. 34.

rank in society of which we have been so long despoiled, and which was conferred by the God of our fathers as an unalienable inheritance.

Adieu, dear Isaacs; I shall write you again when I reach the capital of the Ottoman empire.

NATHAN JOSEPH.

TO MR. R. CARLILE, DORCHESTER GAOL.

DEAR SIR,

Liverpool, Nov. 27, 1822.

A FEW friends, advocates of toleration have conferred on me the honour of collecting their mites for you, and addressing a few lines to you on their behalf. It being mine and their opinions that the enormous fines and imprisonment which you and your worthy family have been doomed to undergo, (for publishing works we are convinced will in a very short time be venerated by every honest member of society) are unjust and oppressive in the extreme. The people at large should have been allowed to decide the fate of those works, and if they had been false and immoral, as the worthy authorities of the day have adjudged them, the force of truth and reason would very soon have put them down without the aid of fines and imprisonment. But instead of their being false and immoral they are the very reverse: They detect and expose a set of reptiles (the black beetles I mean, I shall not call them men) who make it their whole study to deceive and bewilder the minds of their fellow-beings, that they may live in luxury and ease at the expence of their deluded dupes. It was on this account that people were not allowed to be their own judges as to what was proper for them to read. These works contained nothing but truth and reason, the two direct foes of priestcraft and superstition. It need not then be wondered at, that the locusts did all they could to crush them in the bud by persecuting you their most able defender. But, Sir, they shall be foiled, you are gaining strength daily, persevere then manfully as you have hitherto done, and the victory will soon be yours. The day cannot be far distant, when truth and reason shall trample on the wreck of priestcraft and superstition.

Wishing health and happiness to you and your family and success to the glorious cause,

I remain your sincere Friend,

THOMAS LINDSAY.

Subscriptions from Liverpool.

	£. s. d.		£. s. d.
Thomas Lindsay	2 2 0	A Friend to the Oppressed	0 2 6
J. Lilly, one that hopes to see all churches turned into Schools of Science	1 1 0	Dr. Syntax	0 1 0
R. Lilly, a Deist	0 5 0	A lovely Female Deist	0 1 0
W. S. a North Briton	0 5 0	A young Bird	0 1 0
John Greenwood, one who detests Priests, Kings, and all other Tyrants	0 1 0	Another Bird	0 1 0
John Gornal, a believer in the Church of Rome, but no bigot	0 1 2	Ditto	0 1 0
James Burton, a believer in no Church	0 0 4	A Butcher who almost splits his sides with laughter, whenever he thinks of the Devil in the herd of swine	0 1 0
		Mr James Gray	0 1 0
		Mr. John Tilford	0 5 0
		D. Ross	0 1 0
		Mr. Hall	0 1 0

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

J. E. C.'s Second Communication has been received, and shall find as early an insertion as the Articles and Letters that have come before it will admit of.

*Subscription of a few Friends at SKIPTON, Yorkshire, by the hands of Mr. MANN,
of Leeds.*

	s. d.		s. d.
Three Friends	0 6	A Friend to Liberty	0 6
A Friend to Liberty	0 6	J. Harrison	1 0
R. Wilson	5 0	J. W.	0 6
E. Sevire	1 0	J. E.	0 6
J. Smith	4 0	W. F.	0 6
B. Bannister	1 0	An Enemy to Persecution	0 3
C. S. at the tune of Kick the Rogues out	1 0	W. P.	1 0
H. Dixon	1 0	An Enemy to Persecution	0 6
		A Clogger, but not the Bishop	1 0

Subscriptions from CHARLTON, near Leeds.

James Buckley, an Homousiast and Disciple of Nature	4 9	An Enemy to Oppression	2 6
A Friend to Free Discussion and unrestrained Liberty of the Press	2 0	D. Idle, an Enemy to Priest- craft and Delusion	0 6
		Wm. Land, an Enemy to Tithes and Easter Offerings	0 3

Subscriptions left at 19, Union Street, Southwark.

R. Humphries (monthly)	4 0	William Stote (monthly)	4 0
------------------------	-----	-------------------------	-----

}

One Pound is acknowledged from a few Friends in Boston, by U.

Received at 5, Water Lane, Fleet Street, £6. from a few Friends in the City Road, with 450 Farthings, the savings of a Young Lady 10 years old, sent as a present to Thomas Paine Carlile.

William Donald, 5s.

Subscriptions for Mrs. Susanna Wright.

A man who admires the *fair sex*, and detests *foul play*, even from the **BEST** hen-pecked *cock* that ever crowed on his own dunghill; takes this opportunity of laying at the feet of an honest *woman*, Mrs. Wright, one sovereign, and a crown to boot, because she seems, in *sterling worth*, more valuable than the *whole regal fraternity* in the world, who generally think they possess the *divine right to do wrong* with impunity, and are invariably supported in their greatest *iniquities* by all the *crafts* sanctioned by the **GLORIOUS TRINITY** of *Gospel, Law, and State*, now under the *celestial wings* of the *Devil*, the *Pope*, and the *Holy Alliance*, a *double Trinity combined!!!*

Mrs. S. Wright returns thanks to "An Enemy to Persecution," for Five Pounds, sent through the Edinburgh Post.